UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/660,213 | 09/11/2003 | Darren T. Sapashe | CM06328J | 6551 |
| MOTOROLA, | 7590 07/14/200 INC | EXAMINER | | |
| | GONQUIN ROAD | FAULK, DEVONA E | | |
| SCHAUMBUR | kG, IL 60196 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2615 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 07/14/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

APT099@motorola.com
Docketing.Schaumburg@motorola.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 10/660,213 | SAPASHE ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| DEVONA E. FAULK | 2615 | |

| | BEVOIT E. I MOER | 2010 |
|---|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence address |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>08 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | g date of the final rejection. | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection. |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat | of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t | filed within two months of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, l (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | nsideration and/or search (see NO | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | tter form for appeal by materially rec | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | ected cialms. |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13 | | mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). | · | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | I be entered and an explanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fails to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attached. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. | it does NOT place the application in | condition for allowance because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other: | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | |
| /Vivian Chin/ | | |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2615 | | |
| | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Regarding the specification objection, the applicant asserts that the specification provides antecedent basis for " monitoring only background noise levels" and monitoring subsequent background audio level alone" on page 2, lines 18-21. Page 2, lines 18-21 states that "In accordance with the present invention, there is provided herein an improved automatic volume control (AVC) technique for a communication device. In accordance with the present invention, an intelligent automatic volume control technique takes a measurement of the environment (background noise) at the time a user manually selects the volume. A user preference of the volume setting made relative to the background noise experienced is thus established. ". The examiner asserts that this does not read on " monitoring only background noise levels" and monitoring subsequent background audio level alone". The examiner is maintaining the specification objection and the associated claim objection. The examiner stands by the interpretation of the claim used in the rejection (monitoring subsequent background noise levels) and monitoring background noise levels).

Regarding prior art Cooper, the applicant asserts that Cooper fails to teach of switchably engaging a microphone. The examiner disagrees. Cooper teaches in column 4. lines 21-32 that "In accordance with the present invention, the ambient noise level is first examined in step S101. If the ambient noise level is found not to have changed at all or not enough to constitute a change (no in step S102), then the microprocessor 12 skips ahead to step S105, and no action is taken. However, if a new ambient noise level is detected (yes in step S102), the microprocessor fetches audio parameters for the new level from the personality storage (either EEPROM or flash memory) (step S103). In step S104, these parameters are assembled into a message, which is then sent to the DSP 20.

The ambient noise level checked in step S101 is determined in accordance with either the volume setting (determined by the position of the volume knob) or a direct sampling of ambient noise using the digitized microphone audio input 22. With respect to determining the volume setting, it is assumed that a high volume setting is indicative of a high ambient noise level. The microprocessor accesses an audio parameter table including the audio parameters stored in the EEPROM 16 and/or flash memory 18 in accordance with the volume setting or the sampled ambient noise level. "

Therefore Cooper teaches of an implied switching or selectively engaging a microphone which reads on the claim language.

The remainder of the applicant's arguments are moot since the assertions for those arguments revolve around "monitoring only background noise levels" and "monitoring subsequent background audio level alone" which, as noted above, the examiner has interpreted as "monitoring background noise levels" and monitoring subsequent background audio level" due to the lack of antecedent basis.